

ತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ತಾವು ಪట్ಲಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಕಟ ಮಾಡಕೂಡದು.

PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue).—I beg to lay on the Table Notification No. RD. 20 SPS 58, dated 19 September, 1958, issued under clause (a) of sub-section (1) of section 9 of the Mysore Stamp Act, 1957.

SENATE OF MYSORE UNIVERSITY.

Motion for Election.

Sri B. D. JATTI (Chief Minister).—I beg to move :

‘That this Assembly do proceed to elect one member to the Senate of the Mysore University in accordance with sub-section (2) of Section 45 of the Mysore University Act, 1956, to fill up a vacancy in the Senate.’

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

‘That this Assembly do proceed to elect one member to the Senate of the Mysore University in accordance with sub-section (2) of Section 45 of the Mysore University Act, 1956, to fill up a vacancy in the Senate.’

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The programme will be circulated to Hon'ble Members later on.

Members' Representations re Delay in Disposal of Questions

*ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ (ಗುಬ್ಬಿ).—ಈಗತಾನೇ ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ರೇವಣ್ಣಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪನವರು ಹೇಳಿದಹಾಗೆ ನಮಗಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಸಮಾಧಾನಕರವಾದ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡಿ. ಅತಿ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಉತ್ತರಗಳು ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮೊನ್ನೆಪೊನ್ನೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಉತ್ತರಗಳು ಬಂದಿವೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕಳುಹಿಸಲು ಯಾವಯಾವುದು ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೋ ಅಂತಹ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ವಿತ್‌ಹೋಲ್ಡ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಾನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿರುವ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳ ಸಕುಲಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ತಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ನನ್ನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ ನಂತರ ಬಂದಂಥ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರಗಳು ಬರು

ತ್ತಿವೆ. ಏತಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ನಾವು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸುವುದು? ಅವು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಬರಬೇಕು, ಸದಸ್ಯರೆಲ್ಲರ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆರು ತಿಂಗಳ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದಂಥ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಉತ್ತರಗಳು ಬಂದಿವೆ. 1957ನೆಯ ಮಾರ್ಚ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ ನನ್ನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಈ ತಿಂಗಳಿನಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಉತ್ತರ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಕೂಡಲೆ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಡೈರೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ನನ್ನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಕೂಡಲೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ಉತ್ತರ ದೊರೆಯುವಂತೆ ತಕ್ಕ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಅತಿ ಜಾಗೃತ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA (Nanjangud).—Some days back I made a request to the Speaker to kindly convene, if he thinks it necessary, a meeting of the members of this House to see how best to expedite the disposal of these questions. A large number of questions are sent by members particularly in view of the privilege extended to them of sending any number of questions at any time of the year and not necessarily during the session. So I think there is a needless accumulation of questions pending both in the Government Secretariat and in the Legislature Secretariat. I think it would be very desirable if an early meeting is convened and ways and means are devised for disposing of these questions in an expeditious manner. Otherwise members will be merely satisfying their vanity of sending questions without there being any guarantee about getting answers for them in proper time. We may, if possible, follow the Lok Sabha practice of fixing a time limit for answering questions. Otherwise, I am afraid there will be a glut in the question market and there will be no manner of disposal of the questions.

Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA (Hospet).—Some time ago there was a practice of making a statement giving the number of questions received and the number of questions to which answers have been received from the Government. That was a very nice practice. If that statement could be made periodically by the Chair it would help all of us because we find that some of the questions that we sent as far back as February and March have not been answered as yet.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I can give those figures tomorrow.

Sri A. V. NARASIMHA REDDY (Bangalore South).—So far as the procedure regarding questions is concerned, the Rules Committee's Report is coming up for discussion during this session. I do not know whether our friend Sri Mallaradhya has looked into the agenda of the session. When that item comes up for discussion the whole House will have an opportunity to discuss it and evolve the procedure that we want to follow in future.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA (Minister for Law).—I want to make one submission in this connection. Members should not go with the impression that answers are delayed at Government level. We have tried to answer almost all the questions sent to us in time, but there is not sufficient time in the House to go through all the questions that are sent for reply. Probably, more than a thousand questions with replies are pending in the Legislature Secretariat for want of time to take them up in the House. Therefore, if the number of questions to be given by members is limited, it would be possible for us to supply the answers in time and for the House to consider the answers at the proper time.

*Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA (Minister for Public Works).—There is one more point which I would like to bring to the notice of the Chair and also of the House. Sometimes it so happens that questions which were put about 1 or 1½ years back are answered now in the House, but the state of affairs will have changed and that is specially so in the case of the Public Works Department. So I submit that the House may consider and adopt the practice prevailing some time back. According to that practice, the number of questions that each member can send is limited and they must be given well in time. Then we will try and see that correct answers are sent in time. Unless some kind of limitation is placed in regard to the time of sending questions and the number of questions that can be sent, I submit that the answers that would be given would be very, very old because it would be very

difficult for us at this distance of time to get the latest position and give the information to the House. Therefore, the old procedure will be advantageous to the members also inasmuch as they will get the latest replies. If questions are sent 15 days prior to the session, the latest answer could be ascertained and furnished to the members of the House.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ತಮ್ಮೆಲ್ಲರ ಸಲಹೆಗಳಿಗೆ ನಾನು ಮೊದಲು ಉತ್ತರ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ತಾವೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಪಡುವಂತೆ, ಬಹಳ ದಿವಸಗಳಿಂದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳು ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಇವೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೂ ಸಂಶಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಮತ್ತೊಂದು, ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನೂ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಉತ್ತರ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗಿಲ್ಲವೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಮಾತಾಗಿದೆ. ಈಗ ಸಾಧಾರಣವಾಗಿ ಸುಮಾರು ಒಂದು ಸಾವಿರ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ನನ್ನ ಅನುಭವದಲ್ಲಿ ದಿನವಕಿ 15-16 ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗಿಂತಲೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಉತ್ತರಪಡೆಯ ಬೇಕೆಂಬುದು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೆ ನನಗೆ ದೊರೆತ ಮಾಹಿತಿ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸುಮಾರು ನಾಲ್ಕು ಸಾವಿರ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳು ಬಂದಿವೆ. ಈ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಸಾವಿರ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ಸುಮಾರು ಎರಡು ಸಾವಿರ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ತಮ್ಮಿಂದ ತಡವಾಗಿರುವುದು ಹೇಳಿದುದನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿ ನನಗೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ದುಃಖ ಎನ್ನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ತಡವಾಗಿದೆ ಮತ್ತು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ತಡವಾಗಿದೆ ಒಂದು ಮಾತು ಶ್ರೀ ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪನವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು ಸರಿ. ಅವರು ಅಲಿವೇಶನ್ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಕಳುಹಿಸುವುದೇ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಈಗ ಹೊಸ ನಿಯಮಾವಳಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಲಿಮಿಟ್ ಮಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ಅಡ್ಮಿನ್ ಮಾಡಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೂ ಹತ್ತು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗಿಂತಲೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಳುಹಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು ಅಧಿವೇಶನ ನಡೆದಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಅಧಿವೇಶನ ಸೇರುವುದರೊಳಗಾಗಿ ಯಾವಾಗಲಾದರೂ ಹತ್ತು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಕಳುಹಿಸಬಹುದು. ಅದೂ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ತಲುಪಿದಂಥದಿಂದ 15 ದಿವಸಗಳೊಳಗಾಗಿ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೆ 15 ದಿವಸಗಳೊಳಗಾಗಿ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡಲು ಕಾರಣಾಂತರಗಳಿಂದ ತಡವಾದರೆ, ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಪಡೆದು, 15 ದಿವಸಗಳು ಸಾಲದು, ಮತ್ತೆ 15 ದಿವಸಗಳು ಕೊಡಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಬಹುದು. ಈ ಹೊಸ ನಿಯಮ ಡ್ರಾಫ್ಟ್ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ನಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತರುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲವಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನನಗೂ ಒಂದು ತರಹ ವ್ಯಥೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಬಹಳ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳು ಎಂಬ ದೊರೂ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಮತ್ತು ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಉತ್ತರ ಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಬರಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂಬ ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆಯೂ ಸಹ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಮಾರು 208 ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಧಾರಣವಾಗಿ 100 ಜನರು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಕಳುಹಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನೂರು ಜನರೂ ಹತ್ತುತ್ತು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನೇ ಕಳುಹಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಕಡಮೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ. ನುಮಾರು ಒಂದು ಸಾವಿರ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಾದವು. ಅದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೂ ಎಷ್ಟು ದಿವಸಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಉತ್ತರ ಪಡೆಯಬಹುದೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಲೆಕ್ಕ ಹಾಕಬಹುದು.

2-30 P.M.

ಆ ರೀತಿ ಲೆಕ್ಕ ಹಾಕಿ ಮುದ್ರಣ ಮಾಡಿಸುತ್ತೇವೆ. ದಿನಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟೊಂದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿ ಬಿಡಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಮುಂದಿ ಸಿ ಹಂಚಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ದಿನದಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳು ರಾಫ್ಸ್ ಆಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಈ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಮಾಡುವುದರಿಂದ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳ ಮೇಲೆಯೂ ಒಂದು ಹತೋಟಿಯಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಈಗೇನಾಗಿವೆಯೆಂದರೆ, ಸದಸ್ಯರು ತಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಇಂದು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳದಿದ್ದರೆ ನಾಳೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಭಾವಿಸಿ ಎಲ್ಲ ವಿಷಯಗಳ ಮೇಲೆಯೂ ಇನ್ನಷ್ಟು ಸಖ್ಯೆ ಮೆಂಟರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೇಳುವ ಕುತೂಹಲವುಳ್ಳವರಾಗಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಹೊಸ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯಿಂದ, ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಸಖ್ಯೆ ಮೆಂಟರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೇಳದರೆ ಇನ್ನೊಬ್ಬರ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲದ ಹಾಗಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡು ಒಬ್ಬರಿಗೊಬ್ಬರು ತಮ್ಮ ಮೇಲೆ ತಾವೇ ಹತೋಟಿಯನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಈಗ ರಿವೈಸ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಈ ಹೊಸ ನಿಬಂಧನೆಗಳು ಬರುವ ತಿಂಗಳು ವಿಳನೆಯ ತಾರೀಖು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಇವೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದೇ ದಿವಸ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಕಾರಣವೇನೆಂದರೆ, ರೂಲ್ ಮೇಕಿಂಗ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ಒಮ್ಮೆ ಕರಡು ನಿಬಂಧನೆಗಳನ್ನು ತಯಾರಿಸಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಿಂದ ವಿರ್ಪಾಡಾದ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಕಮಿಟಿ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಅವರು ಕೂಡ ಸೂಕ್ತ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಸಭೆಯವರು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಕಾಲ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾದ ಕಾರಣವಿಲ್ಲ. ವಿಳನೆಯ ತಾರೀಖು ಇದರ ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೊಸ ನಿಬಂಧನೆಗಳು ಬರುತ್ತವೆ. ಅನಂತರ ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಸುಲಭವಾಗಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ನಾನು ಭಾವಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY (Mysore City).—Sir, there is one date put against the question and another against the answer. For example, take question No. 836. It is tabled by Sri M. Hanumanthiah. He has put the question on 28th May 1957. As against the name of Sri Kadidal Manjappa, the date put down is 26th August 1958. That would mean fourteen months. I want to know what this date indicates, whether the Government have taken 14 months to answer, or the answers were received earlier

Mr. SPEAKER.—No, no. ಉತ್ತರದ ಪಕ್ಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಕಿರುವ ತಾರೀಖು, ಆ ದಿನ ನಮ್ಮ ಅಫೀಸಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬಂದಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಅರ್ಥ.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—There is another question, Sir, on page 8.

L.A.

Question No. 1899. The difference between the date of question and the date of answer is thirteen months, and about the question which was very important regarding Courts, the Question was put on 13th November 1957 and the answer is given ten months later. I do not know whether this could be called delay or . . .

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is delay of course.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—Sir, I would like to say that the answers are sent after some months' delay because the Government was so certain that we had sufficient work in the House. But hereafter if you limit the number of questions, within 15 days, we will get the answers and give you.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—To say that delay at Government level was because, we had sufficient in the House is very very

Mr. SPEAKER.—Whether the questions will be taken up in the House is a different matter altogether. When a question is sent, it is taken for granted that a reply should be sent.

Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA.—Sir, you mentioned about the 7th of November when things will be re-arranged for the future. But what about the questions pending now with the Secretariat and the Government?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I would like to give a reply. I did not reply last time because. I did not know that such a question would be raised in this House. But now it has been raised, I may say that the questions that have been sent and for which replies have been received from Government will be taken up—as many questions as possible—and finished during the sitting of the Assembly. But I am very doubtful because we are taking a lot of time in putting supplementary questions and I have not been able to check the Hon'ble Members. There is a rule even now that the list which is not exhausted on that day will lapse, in the sense that the other questions which are not taken up will go into the record without supplementaries.

*Sri N. RACHIAH (Minister for Excise and Social Welfare).—Sir, I think that the present situation has arisen on account of the abrupt change of proce-

(SRI N. RACHIAH)

dure after integration. For this matter, I do not think that either the Government or the Speaker could be blamed. According to the present procedure, so long as the Members are allowed to send innumerable questions without restriction, no Government would be able to furnish answers well in time.

You just now said, Sir, that during the session of a particular time, certain questions should be sent and you were going to accept, and you also stated that certain questions which were not answered or taken up on the floor of the House would lapse. In the Lok Sabha the procedure is—generally the time given is only one hour every day for questions. The Lok Sabha sits for not less than seven to eight months in a year. Over and above one hour, they do not allow for question hour. My experience is that within that time, that one hour, they answer at least forty questions. But what is happening here is, even for a minor question, unnecessary time is taken away by the House. In the Lok Sabha for any question there will not be more than one or two supplementary questions and at the most more than five supplementare questions will not be allowed. If more information is required by a members generally the rules provide for half an hour discussion and the members can raise a debate. If the matter is more important, the House and the Speaker would allow the matter to be debated. The Government also would be very happy to clarify the position on such occasions if it is an important matter. Here, I do not think the Government should be blamed for not furnishing answers well in time. To say that Government are not willing to furnish the answers is not correct. Government are prepared to furnish any information or any answer whatsoever well in time if the number of questions are restricted. That is my opinion.

Sri G. N. PUTTANNA (Tumkur).—I think if the Hon'ble Minister had not been a Minister, he would have given a different idea. I have sent half a dozen questions in May 1957. Till today, I have not received any answer,

Mr. SPEAKER.—You have given me a notice.

*Sri G. N. PUTTANNA.—With due respect to the Chair, I say it is not a notice. It is a reminder. I feel that though the answers have been received from the concerned Departments, the Government is purposely holding them up according to my information. Hon'ble, Sri Rachiah stated just now about the parliamentary procedure that not more than five or six supplementary questions are allowed. It may be. But yet the Parliament allows a member to send any number of questions. Therefore here also we should not be prevented from sending questions. But Government should not take one year and seven months to answer a question. I will give concrete examples. As spoken by the Speaker, there is delay. I have requested the concerned Secretary and I have also addressed the Chief Secretary. Even then there has been no reply. This is Democracy!

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is no use discussing this point. Anyhow, we are trying to overcome the difficulty. As soon as the rules are adopted, this difficulty will be over. I would like at the same time to say—I am not blaming the Government because of the delay—that it is much better that we accept the position as it is, delay on the Governmental side, as well as on our side, *i.e.*, the Assembly side. It is much better to accept. Let us not indulge in recriminations against each other.

But at the same time I have also observed in this respect what is happening in other Assemblies. I have seen the Andhra Pradesh Assembly. I have also observed the proceedings thrice in Madras. I find on an average they answer not less than 30 to 40 questions a day. I enquired why they have been able to finish so many questions a day whereas we have not been able to finish more than 20 questions a day. I was told that the difference in their opinion—and I think it is correct—seems to be because we have in this House written replies given to the members before the questions are taken up with the result that the members come well prepared with a volley of supplementaries.

Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA.—What about Bombay?

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is the same procedure as we have here. What happens in Lok Sabha and Andhra Pradesh as well as in Madras and also in Kerala is, the Minister reads the replies in the House and then the supplementaries are put with the result that supplementaries are few and far between. Unless it is a very important short notice question, I have not seen any question taking more than a minute or a minute and a half. That was the reason why I was insisting on the Committee that we must adopt such a procedure. But the Members did not agree. They maintain that the present procedure of having written replies before they come to the Assembly is a better procedure. Even under the rules which are going to be adopted, the difficulties would be the same. My friend Dr. Nagan Gowda asked about the procedure in Bombay. The procedure there is that replies are printed just as in our Assembly and distributed to the members about two hours or one hour before the Assembly actually meets. Of course experience differs from place to place. The questions in Bombay are lengthy and they contain 7 or 8 or 9 or even 10 clauses, and my Hon'ble friend the Chief Minister will bear me out in this respect because he knows as much as I, with the result that supplementaries there used to be very few. There is difference between Bombay and here in that the questions here are short. They do not cover more than four clauses. Usually, I get questions sometimes covering a number of clauses up to ten and I split them up or disallow with the result that those clauses which are not covered by the question will be put here as supplementaries. That is the reason why we have not been able to take up as many questions as they take up either in Bombay or in Andhra Pradesh or in Madras Assembly. Anyhow, this difficulty may be overcome after the new rules are adopted. I am sure I will be able to overcome the difficulty and the members also will be satisfied with the procedure.

Sri G. N. PUTTANNA.—Will the answers given there be accurate or will they give any ambiguous answers?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I cannot understand what is meant by accurate or ambiguous answers.

Sri G. N. PUTTANNA.—When a question is asked, if the reply given is accurate, correct and precise, there will not be so many supplementaries. But the answers generally will be ambiguous and not clear and they avoid giving answers.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Personally I cannot accept the proposition that the replies are vague from the Government. Sometimes, some replies are bound to be vague because the Government may not have the proper information. But on most occasions, in almost all cases, the Government replies are correct. If the members feel that the Government replies are not proper or are vague, they may pursue putting supplementaries.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU (Cubbonpet).—Sir, with regard to this question.....

Sri G. SIVAPPA (Chitradurga).—I rise to a point of order. My point of order is this: if we go on cross-examining the Speaker, the whole day may be taken. We have already spent more than an hour.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I would request the Hon'ble Member Sri Naidu not to pursue the point. I have already made myself clear and there the point should end. I must request him once again that he must allow the House to proceed with the Business.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—I will take another opportunity with regard to this subject. The only point I was worried about is this. If at all a member is entitled to any privilege, it is knowing information from the Government and the Government cannot say lightly that they are not obliged to furnish information. I want to bring to your notice that there are questions which have been placed before the House even before you assumed the Chair and they have not been answered so far.

Mr. SPEAKER.—How can that be?

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—I would bring to the notice of the Chief Minister that with regard to Stores Purchase Committee there are several questions and not one of them has been answered on the floor; the file is becoming bulkier and the Government is not bothered; we have not got the answers and the members who raised the questions disappear. But I will tell you the precious rights of members remain and it will remain for all time. It is for all of us to safeguard that right and I hope the Chair will give proper answer to that question. The Hon'ble Minister Sri Rachiah said that we are adopting a procedure by which it is impossible for any Government to furnish answers. With all humility I say that if they are not prepared to answer or if they are not capable of giving answers, it only reflects on the Government.

Sri N. RACHIAH.—I did not say so.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have already given the reply to what you have just now said. Of course, there has been delay. Under the new procedure there will be no delay. Let us not indulge in pointing who is the guilty party. It is no use. After all, we have to take things as they are and the best course for us is to revise the rules of Procedure. We are doing that on the 7th and then this difficulty will disappear.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—My only point is that the Government must explain for the delay. That is what I am anxious about. I am not worried why delay is caused, but the Government must explain for the delay.

Mr. SPEAKER.—After all, how can the Government explain the delay? They can only say that there has been delay.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA (Palaiyam).—What are the reasons for this delay?

Mr. SPEAKER.—In that case, they will have to explain for the delay not only with reference to one question, but all the questions. How can it be possible? It is not fair for the members to pursue the point like this.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Are we not going to consider this matter in the Rules Committee stage?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yes.

Sri M. RAMAPPA (Harihar).—I want to say something.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You may tell me in my chambers.

Sri M. RAMAPPA.—I want to make a personal explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You are also an old member. You must know the procedure that before raising any point here, it is better that you see me in my chamber and I will try to correct it.

MYSORE CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES BILL, 1958.

Motion to consider.

Sri MALI MARIAPPA (Minister for Co-operation).—Sir, I move:

“That the Mysore Co-operative Societies Bill, 1958, be taken into consideration.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved:

“That the Mysore Co-operative Societies Bill, 1958, be taken into consideration.”

ಶ್ರೀ ಮಾಲಿ ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಮಸೂದಾ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ಅಗತ್ಯವಿದೆ. ರಾಜ್ಯ ಪುನರ್ ವಿಂಗಡಣೆಯಾದ ಮೇರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೂ ಸಹ ಐದು ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಭಾಗಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹಕಾರ ಸಂಘಗಳಿಗೆ ಆನ್ಯಾಯವಂತೆ ಐದು ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳ ರಚನೆಯಾದ್ದು ನಮ್ಮ ಗೆಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ತಿಳಿದಂಥ ವಿಚಾರ. ಕೆಲವು ಕಾನೂನುಗಳ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಮನ್ವಯಗೊಳಿಸುವ ಕಾರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಸಾಧಿಸಿದ್ದಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಸಹಕಾರ ಸಂಘಗಳ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಸಹ ಸಮನ್ವಯವನ್ನು ಸಾಧಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ತರಬೇಕಾದುದಾಗಿದೆ. ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಐದು ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಭಾಗಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಜಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಂಥ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ತೀವ್ರತರವಾದ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಗಳಾಗುವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆಯಾ ಸ್ಥಳ ಮತ್ತು ಸನ್ನಿವೇಶಗಳಿಗನುಗುಣವಾಗಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಜಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಂಥ ಬಹು ಭಾಗ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಕಾನೂನಿನಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಸಹ ಅಡಕಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಎರಡನೆಯ ಪಂಚವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ಯೋಜನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡಕವಾಗಿರುವ ಸಹಕಾರಿ ಆಂದೋಲನದ ಕೆಲವು ಸ್ಥಿತಿಮುಗಳಿಗೆ ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರಾರ್/ಅವರು ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಸಾಲದ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹಾಯ ಧನವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಗಳು ಈ ಕಾನೂನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಣ